



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bible verse that tells what becomes of God's people after they die." Appropriate texts, correctly written, are the exceptions; blanks, or worse, the rule. The strongest answer both in regard to heaven and hell, Matt. 25:46, is given a few times correctly, oftener imperfectly. A frequent answer to the first of the questions is, "The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God," which the Revision now shows, as commentaries have shown before, is only a reference to the fact that the vices of the wicked, whether individuals or nations, hurry them prematurely to the grave, to "Sheol." Texts about Heaven are much more frequent in these papers than texts about Hell, though it is not so in the Bible, a fact whose significance is not uncertain. Extemporizing Scripture on this crucial doctrine of hell is peculiarly unfortunate; but the following are only samples of what is found, in place of God's exact warnings, in many papers: "Depart from me ye workers of iniquity into a lake of everlasting fire prepared for you." (The Bible says that the fire was prepared for the "devil and his angels," and the "mansions" for men.) "The wicked shall go away into everlasting death." "They are cast into everlasting eternity." "They are cast into Hell's fire and the devil's hands." "The wicked shall go to the devil and his angels." (Now we know who gets up "corners.") Such crazy quilts, made up of texts imperfectly remembered and teachings imperfectly understood, occur in scores of papers under each of the questions that call for Scripture answers.

Are the results of the examination discouraging? Nay, they should be only arousing. To use a medical figure, if one finds, by an insurance examination, that he has dangerous symptoms, for which, however, a sure cure is at hand, he congratulates himself that he has been warned in time. Deficient as our Sabbath-schools are in knowledge of the Bible, there is no proof that the youth of our land ever understood or practiced its truths more than to-day, and so, in the face of the facts given, we should go forward to better things, with the motto, "Always encouraged, never satisfied."

SOME LEVITICAL USAGES.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN G. LANSING, D. D.,

New Brunswick, New Jersey.

The Hebrew word *Kaf* used in connection with the offering of incense, is, in the A. V., translated "spoons" twenty-four times: as, e. g., Exod. 25:29; Num. 7:14; 1 Kgs. 7:50, *et al.* The R. V. follows the A. V., translating "spoons." Thirteen times out of these twenty-four it occurs in the seventh chapter of Numbers. Elsewhere this Hebrew word *Kaf* occurs frequently, and always has reference to the palm of the hand or the sole of the foot. We have precisely the same word in Arabic, *Kaf*, which is used with the same meaning of the palm of the hand or the sole of the foot. The rendering of this word *Kaf* by "spoons" is misleading. It has reference properly to a kind of *censer*. What kind of *censer* this was, and why it was so called, we are clearly informed by the old Egyptian sculptures and inscriptions. In the temple of Seti I. at Abydos, King Seti is represented in the act of offering incense. The vessel in which he offers the

incense consists of a rod, about the length of the fore-arm, and evidently intended to represent the fore-arm. This fore-arm, or rod, after a slight curvature at one end intended to represent the joint of the elbow, another further on representing the wrist, terminates at the other extremity in a hand with the palm, *Kaf*, upward. In the hollow of the palm is a small basin in which is the smoking incense. The whole constitutes the censer, and is held forward by the extended hand of the king in the act of offering incense. The king is also sometimes represented as throwing balls or pastilles of incense into the basin with the other hand. In the temple of Denderah another king appears offering incense with the same kind of censer to the goddess Hathor. The same censer appears frequently in a long inscription on a fine tablet in the Egyptian Room of the Boulak Museum. Again the same censer appears in a superscription of one of the oldest parts of the *Book of the Dead*, as on a papyrus of the same recently brought by the writer from Egypt. Such was the Hebrew censer called *Kaf*. In further proof of the identity of the Hebrew *Kaf* and this old Egyptian censer, we have the old Egyptian names *Kef*, *Kep*, *Kheb*. And not only the Egyptian names of this censer, but the name also of one of the principal compounds, of sixteen ingredients, used for incense in this censer, was the closely related name of *Kuphi*. Why this censer was called *Kaf*, the same word as that for the palm of the hand, is evident from its very shape, as described.

Another word which seems to have received an inaccurate rendering is the Hebrew word *Hazah*, used thirteen times in the Old Testament. It occurs first in Exod. 29:26 in connection with the ram of consecration, and the wave offering. The word is translated "breast" both in the A. V. and R. V. The more correct rendering would be *shoulder*, as it has reference to the fore-quarter of the animal. This is explained and confirmed by Eastern etymology and usage. The corresponding Arabic word is *Khadda*, which, in an animal, has reference particularly to the upper or principal part of the fore-quarter. In Egypt and like countries the sheep or lamb is the favorite animal for food. And in the sheep or lamb it is always the fore-quarter or shoulder that is esteemed above every part of the animal. A person may visit an Egyptian house, as a guest, for years, and while, in honor of the occasion, a quarter of mutton will be the principal meat, still the guest will never have set before him the hind-quarter, but always the fore-quarter or shoulder, as it is esteemed far more highly than any other part. So it was with the ancient Egyptians. In their religious offerings it was the fore-quarter of the sheep or lamb that was presented in offering. This is shown by old Egyptian paintings, inscriptions, and in the mummied remains of several fore-quarters to be seen in the Boulak Museum, and one recently brought by the writer. And with ancient Egyptians the reason for offering the fore-quarter was also because this was the best, the most highly esteemed part of the animal. So in the Levitical wave offering, the shoulder or shoulders, as the most highly esteemed parts, as the best, were offered to the Lord. In the following passages, viz.: Lev. 9:21; 10:14; Num. 6:20; 18:18, the word which is rendered "right shoulder" and "heave shoulder" does not have reference to the fore-quarter or shoulder, but to the hind-quarter. The Hebrew word is "*Shok*." The precisely corresponding Arabic word is "*Sāk*" from "*Sok*," which always has reference to the hind-quarter, and is never properly used of the fore-quarter of an animal.

Once more, the divine command is uttered three times, in the same words, and without note or qualification,—“Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s

milk." What does it mean, and why was the command given? An incident related to me when recently in Egypt will best explain. A small company were for a few moments unwilling spectators of a cruel scene. Among the company was a native servant, an excellent hearted fellow, but not knowing how to read or write. After looking upon the scene for a few seconds, he turned around and exclaimed, in Arabic,—“That is as cruel as seething a kid in its mother’s milk,”—precisely the biblical expression; but he had not derived it from the Bible. It is an oriental expression or simile used to describe an act of great cruelty. Upon inquiring later what the expression meant, the information was given that seething a kid in its mother’s milk meant the taking of the kid from its mother while it was yet sucking, and killing and eating it. And the reason why this was such an act of cruelty, or described an act of great cruelty, was because of the fact that, as with the dove among birds, so with the goat among animals, there is no animal which seems to feel so keenly, and expresses so painfully and humanly its sorrow over the loss of its young as a goat. The divine command was thus in this case, as in so many others, a humanitarian law.

The same humanitarian principle is seen operating in the divine, and at first strange, instructions given in Deut. 22:6,7. The parent bird will soon comfort itself with other eggs or other young, but it will not soon comfort itself with another mate. In the animal kingdom these are matters of actual observation.

AN OLD TESTAMENT LIBRARY.

BY THE EDITOR.

In fulfillment of a promise made in the December STUDENT, the following suggestions are offered, in reply to the question, “Having two hundred dollars to invest in Old Testament literature, what books shall I purchase?” In order to economize space, the list of Professor Peters, as being the simpler and the better of the two, will be taken as a basis. The suggestions offered will be under three heads: 1) Books in Professor Weidner’s list which, in the opinion of the writer, should have been included in the list of Professor Peters; 2) Books in Professor Peter’s list which, perhaps, might well have been omitted; 3) Books omitted by both Professors Weidner and Peters which the writer would have included in such a list.

I. BOOKS IN PROFESSOR WEIDNER’S LIST, BUT OMITTED BY PROFESSOR PETERS.

Gesenius (Robinson), *Hebrew Lexicon*.—Very old, it is true, yet everything considered, superior to Davies, which, it must be confessed, does not give the student the information which is needed.*

Kell, *Biblical Archaeology*, 2 vols.—Old-fashioned, but, nevertheless, very valuable for the collection of facts which it contains.

Curtiss, *Levitical Priests*.—A presentation of the subject, severely criticised by many critics, highly appreciated by the more conservative critics; perhaps

* It is a matter for congratulation that we are soon (within two years, perhaps) to have an edition of Gesenius worthy of the name.